UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,078	01/21/2004	Klass P. Hardeman	047446/273072	4620
826 7590 09/12/2007 ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA			EXAMINER	
			CRANE, LAWRENCE E	
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000 CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000		2 4000	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
<b>*,</b>			1623	
		·	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Eveniner Initiated Interview Summary	10/762,078	HARDEMAN ET AL.
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	L. E. Crane	1623
All Participants:	Status of Application: Res	sponse to F. Rej. filed
(1) <u>L. E. Crane</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Jeffrey Childers</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 22 September 2007	Time: <u>~ 6 PM</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:  Possible art rejection in vew of Haystead et al., cited in Graves et	t al	
Claims discussed: 1 and 31-33 specifically.		
Prior art documents discussed: Haystead et al. and Graves et al.		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar</li> </ul>	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
M Cove		,
(Maminer/SPE Signature) (Applicant	/Applicant's Representative Sig	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Applicant was advised that the instant claims appeared to avoid the prior art in part, but that the disclosure in Haystead et al. appeared to read on claim 1. A return telephone call was requested to discuss this case further and determine whether an advisory action is necessary.